



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/997,977      | 12/03/2001  | Paul L. Bartel       | 2318-387            | 5894             |

6449 7590 06/03/2005

ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & MANBECK, P.C.  
1425 K STREET, N.W.  
SUITE 800  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

SANG, HONG

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1642

DATE MAILED: 06/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|                              |                                      |                                      |  |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b><br>09/997,977 | <b>Applicant(s)</b><br>BARTEL ET AL. |  |
|                              | <b>Examiner</b><br>Hong Sang         | <b>Art Unit</b><br>1642              |  |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 December, 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-51 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-51 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

*Handwritten signature/initials*

## DETAILED ACTION

RE: Bartel et al

### *Election/Restrictions*

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - I. Claims 1-5, 13-17, 25-29, 38-40, 42-43, drawn to a method of screening for drug candidates useful in treating a cancer resulting from a mutation in MMSC1, classified in class 435, subclass 7.1.
  - II. Claims 7-11, 19-23, 31-36, drawn to a method of screening for drug candidates useful in treating a cancer resulting from a mutation in a protein, which protein when wild type binds with wild-type MMSC1, classified in class 435, subclass 7.4, for example.
  - III. Claims 6, 12, 18, 24, 30, 37, 41, 44, 46, 49 and 51, drawn to a drug useful for treating a cancer resulting from a mutation in MMSC1, classified in class 530, subclass 300, for example.
  - IV. Claims 45, 47-48, drawn to a method of screening for drug candidates useful in treating a cancer resulting from a mutation in MMSC1, wherein said method comprises treating an animal, classified in class 424, subclass 9.1
  - V. Claim 50, drawn to a method of screening for drug candidates useful in treating a cancer resulting from a mutation in MMSC1, wherein said

method comprises culturing cells which are homozygous for MMSC1, classified in class 435, subclass 7.23, for example.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

2. Inventions I, II, IV and V are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01).

The instant specification does not disclose that these methods would be used together. The method of screening for drug candidates useful in treating a cancer resulting from a mutation in MMSC1 (Group I), the method of screening for drug candidates useful in treating a cancer resulting from a mutation in a protein, which protein when wild type binds with wild-type MMSC1 (Group II), the method of screening for drug candidates useful in treating a cancer resulting from a mutation in MMSC1, wherein said method comprises treating an animal (Group IV), and the method of screening for drug candidates useful in treating a cancer resulting from a mutation in MMSC1, wherein said method comprises culturing cells which are homozygous for MMSC1 (Group V) are all unrelated as they comprise distinct steps and utilize different products which demonstrates that each method has a different mode of operation. Each invention performs this function using a structurally and functionally divergent material. Moreover, the methodology and materials necessary for the method of screening for drug candidates useful in treating a cancer resulting from a mutation in

Art Unit: 1642

MMSC1 (Group I), the method of screening for drug candidates useful in treating a cancer resulting from a mutation in a protein, which protein when wild type binds with wild-type MMSC1 (Group II), the method of screening for drug candidates useful in treating a cancer resulting from a mutation in MMSC1, wherein said method comprises treating an animal (Group IV), and the method of screening for drug candidates useful in treating a cancer resulting from a mutation in MMSC1, wherein said method comprises culturing cells which are homozygous for MMSC1 (Group V) differ significantly for each of the materials. For the method of screening for drug candidates useful in treating a cancer resulting from a mutation in MMSC1 (Group I), a MMSC1 mutant is used, moreover the protein activity is measured and MMSC1-drug complex is identified; For the method of screening for drug candidates useful in treating a cancer resulting from a mutation in a protein, which protein when wild type binds with wild-type MMSC1 (Group II), a mutant protein is used; For the method of screening for drug candidates useful in treating a cancer resulting from a mutation in MMSC1, wherein said method comprises treating an animal (Group IV), an animal which is homozygous for MMSC1 mutant or an animal which has a tumor and which is homozygous for MMSC1 mutant is used; For the method of screening for drug candidates useful in treating a cancer resulting from a mutation in MMSC1, wherein said method comprises culturing cells which are homozygous for MMSC1 (Group V), cells which are homozygous for MMSC1 mutant are used, moreover, cell morphology and property are studied. Therefore, each method is divergent in materials and steps. For these reasons the Inventions I, II, IV and V are patentably distinct.

Inventions III and I, II, IV, V are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the drug for example peptide can be used to make antibodies, as opposed to its use in treating a cancer. Furthermore, gene therapy can also be used to treat a cancer resulting from a mutation in MMSC1, as opposed to using a drug.

Searching the Invention III and I, II, IV and V together would impose serious search burden. The inventions of Inventions III and I, II, IV and V have a separate status in the art as shown by their different classifications. Moreover, in the instant case, the search for a drug and the method of screening for drug candidates useful in treating a cancer resulting from a mutation in MMSC1 or a mutation in a protein when wild type binds with MMSC1 are not coextensive. Inventions I, II, IV and V encompass molecules and methods which are claimed in terms of protein-protein binding interaction (Inventions I, II, IV and V), protein activity measurement (Invention I), animal studies (Invention IV) and cell culture study (Invention V), which are not required for the search of Invention III. Furthermore, the search for Invention I, II, IV and V would require a text search for the method of screening a drug candidate useful in treating a cancer resulting from a mutation of MMSC1 or a mutation in a protein when wild type binds with MMSC1

Art Unit: 1642

in addition to the drug. Moreover, even if the drug was known, the method of using it to treat cancer may be novel and unobvious in view of the preamble or active steps.

3. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

4. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

5. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

6. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or**

Art Unit: 1642

**otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product** will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.




Art Unit: 1642

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hong Sang whose telephone number is (571) 272 8145. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey Siew can be reached on (571) 272-0787. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

 for:

Hong Sang  
Art Unit 1642  
May 19, 2005